



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,465	06/26/2003	Michael J. Polson	MSI-1515US	3500
22801	7590	07/03/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			HARPER, LEON JONATHAN	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/606,465	POLSON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Leon J. Harper	2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed 4/12/2006 has been entered. Claims 6, 14, 43, 50, 53 have been amended. Claims 1-59 are pending in this office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3-32,34-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004 0175159 (hereinafter Oetzel) in view of US 6925474 (hereinafter McGrath).-

As for claim 1 Oetzel discloses: opening media content that is stored on a DVD (See paragraph 0021 lines 4-8 note that opening dvd to determine the amount of free space means opening the dvd); determining a DVD ID associated with the DVD (See paragraph 0032 and paragraph [0072] note that the "egg" of the dvd contains id information); displaying DVD metadata that is associated with the DVD ID in the database (See paragraph 0062); receiving an indication of a user's acceptance of the DVD metadata that is displayed (See paragraph 0023 note that user has to enter an confirm metadata "if desired");, such that the DVD metadata is associated with the DVD

ID in the local media library (See paragraph 0064 and note egg contains metadata stored with unique serial number).

While Oetzel does discloses storing the DVD metadata that is displayed in a local media library and searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID the disclosure is not explicitly indicated. McGrath however does explicitly disclose storing the DVD metadata that is displayed in a local media library (See column 3 lines 44-50) and searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID (See column 4 lines 30-33). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of McGrath into the system of Oetzel. The modification would have been obvious because downloading the metadata content of a dvd requires both computing power and time, and storing the metadata locally saves even more time and computing power (See Oetzel paragraph 0006).

As for claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses submitting the DVD ID to a server computer system; and receiving search results from the server computer system (See column 3 lines 42-46).

As for claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses: wherein the search results comprise XML-formatted DVD metadata (See column 5 lines 13-16).

As for claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the DVD metadata that is displayed comprises: a DVD title (See paragraph [0069]; and a first chapter title (See paragraph [0091].

As for claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: DVD metadata that is displayed further comprises at least one of: a performer name (See paragraph [0084] ).

As for claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method as recited in claim 1 (See Figure 1 and note that servers must have computer readable instructions on them to carry out the steps of claim 1 or else the computer perform the steps of claim 1).

As for claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses A media player application configured to perform the method as recited in claim 1 (See paragraph [0033] note media player is performing task).

As for claim 9, Oetzel discloses: opening media content that is stored on a DVD (See paragraph 0021 lines 4-8 note that opening dvd to determine the amount of free

space means opening the dvd); determining a DVD ID associated with the DVD (See paragraph 0032 and paragraph [0072] note that the “egg” of the dvd contains id information); receiving an indication of a user request to search for DVD metadata based on search criteria other than the DVD 1D (See figure 25 and paragraph [0113] searching by artist).

While Oetzel does not explicitly disclose searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID; enabling the user to enter search criteria; receiving user-submitted search criteria; searching the database that contains DVD metadata based on the user- submitted search criteria', receiving one or more sets of DVD metadata that satisfy the user-submitted search criteria; and displaying a list of identifiers associated with individual ones of the sets of DVD metadata. McGrath however does explicitly disclose searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID (See column 3 lines 44-50); enabling the user to enter search criteria (see column 3 lines 42-45); receiving user-submitted search criteria; searching the database that contains DVD metadata based on the user- submitted search criteria (See column 3 lines 47-50), receiving one or more sets of DVD metadata that satisfy the user-submitted search criteria; and displaying a list of identifiers associated with individual ones of the sets of DVD metadata (See column 5 lines 13-17). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of McGrath into the system of Oetzel. The

modification would have been obvious because downloading the metadata content of a dvd requires both computing power and time, and storing the metadata locally saves even more time and computing power (See Oetzel paragraph 0006).

As for claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the enabling comprises causing a Wizard user interface to be presented to a user so that information pertaining to the DVD can be collected from the user (See paragraph 0023 and note that all music guide is an interface).

As for claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: the user-submitted search criteria comprises at least a portion of a title associated with the DVD (See paragraph [0076] note that the egg information can be used to open the disc).

As for claim 12, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses: the searching comprises submitting the user-submitted search criteria to a server computer system (See column 3 lines 45-47).

As for claim 13, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the DVD metadata that is displayed comprises: a DVD title (See paragraph [0069]; and a first chapter title (See paragraph [0091].

As for claim 14, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: DVD metadata that is displayed further comprises at least one of: a performer name (See paragraph [0084]).

As for claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: a particular identifier in the list of identifiers comprises a DVD title (See paragraph [0069] note that for DVD's the creator is the manufacture and the egg information is included in the xml list).

As for claim 16, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein a particular identifier in the list of identifiers comprises a DVD title and a release date (See paragraph [0069] and paragraph [0077]).

As for claim 17, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses: receiving an indication of a user selection of a particular identifier from the list of identifiers; and displaying DVD metadata that is associated with the particular identifier (See column 6 lines 7-11).

As for claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further discloses receiving an indication of a user's acceptance of the DVD metadata that is displayed; and storing the DVD metadata that is displayed, such that the DVD metadata is associated with the DVD ID in a local media library (See paragraph 0023 note that user

has to enter and confirm metadata "if desired" also note that information is associated with a particular dvd because menus have to be dynamically allocated).

As for claim 19, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: storing the DVD metadata that is displayed in a DVD user feedback data repository (See last 4 lines of paragraph [0038] note that annotation is user feedback).

As for claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses: formatting the DVD metadata that is displayed according to an XML schema (See column 5 lines 17-20); and transmitting formatted DVD metadata to a server computer system for storage in the user feedback data repository (See column 7 lines 1-5 note the object database stores notes).

As for claim 21, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method as recited in claim 9.(See Figure 1 and note that servers must have computer readable instructions on them to carry out the steps of claim 1 or else the computer perform the steps of claim 1).

As for claim 22, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: A media player application configured to perform the method as recited in claim 9 (See paragraph [0033] note media player is performing task).

As for claim 23 Oetzel discloses: opening media content that is stored on a DVD (See paragraph 0021 lines 4-8 note that opening DVD to determine the amount of free space means opening the DVD); determining a DVD ID associated with the DVD (See paragraph 0032 and paragraph [0072] note that the “egg” of the DVD contains id information); receiving an indication of a user request to associate user-submitted DVD metadata with the DVD; (See paragraph 0023 note that user has to enter an confirm metadata “if desired” also note that information is associated with a particular DVD because menus have to be dynamically allocated); enabling the user to submit DVD metadata, receiving user-submitted DVD metadata (See lines 13-17 of paragraph [0038])

While Oetzel does not explicitly disclose searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID, storing the DVD metadata that is displayed in a media library. McGrath however does explicitly disclose searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID (See column 3 lines 44-50); storing the DVD metadata that is displayed in a media library (See column 3 lines 44-50) It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of McGrath into the system of Oetzel. The

modification would have been obvious because downloading the metadata content of a dvd requires both computing power and time, and storing the metadata locally saves even more time and computing power (See Oetzel paragraph 0006).

As for claim 24, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the enabling comprises causing a Wizard user interface to be presented to a user so that information pertaining to the DVD can be collected from the user (See paragraph 0023 and note that all music guide is an interface).

As for claim 25, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the user-submitted DVD metadata comprises a DVD title and a first chapter title (See paragraph [0069]; and a first chapter title (See paragraph [0091]).

As for claim 26, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses: further comprising storing the user-submitted DVD metadata in a user feedback data repository (See column 7 lines 1-5 note the object database stores notes).

As for claim 27, the rejection of claim 26 is incorporated, and further, McGrath discloses: formatting the DVD metadata that is displayed according to an XML schema (See column 5 lines 17-20); and transmitting formatted DVD metadata to a server computer system for storage in the user feedback data repository (See column 7 lines 1-5 note the object database stores notes).

As for claim 28, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method as recited in claim 23 (See Figure 1 and note that servers must have computer readable instructions on them to carry out the steps of claim 1 or else the computer perform the steps of claim 1).

As for claim 29, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: A media player application configured to perform the method as recited in claim 23 (See paragraph [0033] note media player is performing task).

As for claim 30, Oetzel discloses opening media content that is stored on a DVD (See paragraph 0021 lines 4-8 note that opening DVD to determine the amount of free space means opening the DVD); determining a DVD ID associated with the DVD (See paragraph 0032 and paragraph [0072] note that the “egg” of the DVD contains id information); displaying DVD metadata that is associated with the DVD ID in the database (See paragraph 0062); receiving an indication of a user request to modify the DVD metadata that is displayed; enabling the user to modify the DVD metadata that is displayed; and receiving user-modified DVD metadata (See lines 1-5 of paragraph [0026]).

While Oetzel does disclose searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID the disclosure is not explicitly indicated. McGrath however does explicitly disclose searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID (See column 4 lines 30-33). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of McGrath into the system of Oetzel. The modification would have been obvious because downloading the metadata content of a DVD requires both computing power and time, and having a searchable database for DVD metadata will facilitate retrieval (See Oetzel paragraph 0006).

As for claim 31, the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: further comprising: receiving an indication of the user's acceptance of the user-modified DVD metadata (See paragraph 0023 note that user has to enter an confirm metadata "if desired" also note that information is associated with a particular DVD because menus have to be dynamically allocated);

While Oetzel does disclose storing the user-modified DVD metadata in a local media library such that the user-modified DVD metadata is associated with the DVD ID the disclosure is not explicitly indicated. McGrath however does explicitly disclose storing the user-modified DVD metadata in a local media library such that the user-modified DVD metadata is associated with the DVD ID (See column 3 lines 44-50). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the

invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of McGrath into the system of Oetzel. The modification would have been obvious because downloading the metadata content of a DVD requires both computing power and time, and storing the metadata locally saves even more time and computing power (See Oetzel paragraph 0006).

As for claim 32, Oetzel discloses: determining a DVD ID associated with a particular DVD (See paragraph 0032 and paragraph [0072] note that the “egg” of the DVD contains id information);

Oetzel differs from the claimed invention in that attempting to identify DVD metadata associated with the DVD ID is not explicitly indicated. McGrath however, does disclose attempting to identify DVD metadata associated with the DVD ID (See column 6 lines 7-10). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of McGrath into the system of Oetzel. The modification would have been obvious because identifying the DVD metadata by ID allows for a user to view that information with minimal input.

As for claim 34, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses wherein the attempting comprises performing a search based on the DVD ID against a data repository that stores DVD metadata (See column 7 lines 1-5 note the object database stores notes).

As for claim 35, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: displaying DVD metadata that is identified as being associated with the DVD ID in a data repository of DVD metadata (See column 6 lines 53-55 and 60-61); receiving an indication of a user's acceptance of the displayed DVD metadata(See paragraph 0023 note that user has to enter an confirm metadata "if desired" also note that information is associated with a particular DVD because menus have to be dynamically allocated).

Oetzel differs from the claimed invention in that maintaining the DVD metadata that is displayed in a local media library, such that the DVD metadata is associated with the DVD ID is not explicitly indicated. McGrath however does disclose maintaining the DVD metadata that is displayed in a local media library, such that the DVD metadata is associated with the DVD ID (See column 3 lines 44-50). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of McGrath into the system of Oetzel. The modification would have been obvious because downloading the metadata content of a dvd requires both computing power and time, and displaying the metadata locally saves even more time and computing power (See Oetzel paragraph 0006).

As for claim 36, the rejection of claim 35 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: maintaining the DVD metadata that is displayed in a user feedback data repository (See column 7 lines 1-5 note the object database stores notes).

As for claim 37, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses: enabling a user to enter search criteria (see column 3 lines 42-45); and attempting to identify DVD metadata associated with the DVD based on the search criteria (See column 6 lines 7-10).

As for claim 38, the rejection of claim 37 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the search criteria comprises at least a portion of a DVD title. (See paragraph [0076] note that the egg information can be used to open the disc).

As for claim 39, the rejection of claim 37 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the enabling comprises causing a Wizard user interface to be presented to a user so that information pertaining to the DVD can be collected from the user (See paragraph 0023 and note that all music guide is an interface).

As for claim 40, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses enabling a user to enter DVD metadata to be associated with the DVD (See lines 13-17 of paragraph [0038]);

Oetzel differs from the claimed invention in that maintaining the DVD metadata that is entered by the user in a media library, such that the DVD metadata that is entered by the user is associated with the DVD ID is not explicitly disclosed. McGrath however does disclose maintaining the DVD metadata that is entered by the user in a

media library, such that the DVD metadata that is entered by the user is associated with the DVD ID (See column 3 lines 44-50).

As for claim 41, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the enabling comprises causing a Wizard user interface to be presented to a user so that information pertaining to the DVD can be collected from the user (See paragraph 0023 and note that all music guide is an interface).

As for claim 42, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: enabling a user to edit the DVD metadata that is displayed (See lines 1-5 of paragraph [0026]);

Oetzel differs from the claimed invention in that discloses displaying DVD metadata that is identified as being associated with the DVD ID; and maintaining user-modified DVD metadata in a media library, such that the user-modified DVD metadata is associated with the DVD 1D is not explicitly indicated. McGrath however does disclose discloses displaying DVD metadata that is identified as being associated with the DVD ID (See column 5 lines 14-16); and maintaining user-modified DVD metadata in a media library, such that the user-modified DVD metadata is associated with the DVD 1D (See column 3 lines 44-50). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of McGrath into the system of Oetzel. The modification would have been obvious because

downloading the metadata content of a DVD requires both computing power and time, and storing the metadata locally saves even more time and computing power (See Oetzel paragraph 0006).

As for claim 43, the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the enabling comprises causing a Wizard user interface to be presented to the user so that the DVD metadata that is displayed can be modified by the user. (See paragraph 0023 and note that all music guide is an interface).

As for claim 44, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to implement the method as recited in claim 32 (See Figure 1 and note that servers must have computer readable instructions on them to carry out the steps of claim 1 or else the computer perform the steps of claim 1).

As for claim 45, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and further Oetzel discloses: A media player application configured to perform the method as recited in claim 32 (See paragraph [0033] note media player is performing task).

As for claim 46, Oetzel discloses: a Wizard UI configured to enable a user to select DVD metadata to be associated with the media content, the DVD metadata to be

stored in the media library. (See paragraph 0023 and note that all music guide is an interface).

Oetzel differs from the claimed invention in that a media player application stored in the memory and executed on the processor for playing media content stored on a DVD, and a media library stored in the memory for maintaining DVD metadata associated with the media content are not explicitly disclosed. McGrath however, discloses: a media player application stored in the memory and executed on the processor for playing media content stored on a DVD (See paragraph [0033] note media player is performing task); a media library stored in the memory for maintaining DVD metadata associated with the media content (See column 3 lines 44-50); and a Wizard UI configured to enable a user to select DVD metadata to be associated with the media content, the DVD metadata to be stored in the media library. It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Oetzel into the system of McGrath. The modification would have been obvious because a wizard interface simplifies the application for the user.

As for claim 47, the rejection of claim 46 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the Wizard UI is further configured to enable a user to submit user-entered DVD metadata to be associated with the media content in the media library (See lines 1-4 of paragraph 0026 "open DVD form and figure 7").

As for claim 48, the rejection of claim 46 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: wherein the Wizard UI is further configured to enable a user to modify DVD metadata to be associated with the media content (See lines 1-4 of paragraph 0026 “open DVD form)

As for claim 49, the rejection of claim 46 is incorporated, and further Oetzel disclose wherein the Wizard U1 is further configured to enable a user to submit search criteria to be used to identify DVD metadata that may be associated with the media content (See paragraph 0026 and figure 29 “means for searching).

As for claim 50 Oetzel discloses; means for locating DVD metadata that may be associated with the media content based on the DVD ID; and means for displaying the DVD metadata that may be associated with the media content to a user (See paragraph 0064 “on screen descriptive”).

Oetzel differs from the claimed invention in that means for generating a DVD ID based on media content stored on the DVD is not explicitly indicated. McGrath however, does disclose means for generating a DVD ID based on media content stored on the DVD (See column 4 lines 33-36 UMID has 64 bytes based on DVD). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teachings of Oetzel into the system of McGrath. The modification would have been

obvious because by generating the DVD id from content on the DVD will ensure that for each unique DVD you get a unique id.

As for claim 51, the rejection of claim 50 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses means for locating DVD metadata that may be associated with the media content base on user-submitted search criteria. (See column 3 lines 47-50).

As for claim 52, the rejection of claim 50 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses means for enabling a user to submit DVD metadata to be associated with the media content', and means for associating the DVD metadata with the media content. (See lines 1-5 of paragraph [0026]).

As for claim 53, the rejection of claim 50 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: means for enabling a user to modify DVD metadata that is associated with the DVD ID; and means for associating user-modified D'VD metadata with the media content (See lines 3-6 of paragraph [0028]).

As for claim 54, the rejection of claim 50 is incorporated, and further McGrath discloses means for enabling user selection of DVD metadata to be associated with the media content (See column 6 lines 53-58); and means for associating the DVD metadata with the media content (See column 4 lines 65-68).

As for claim 55, McGrath discloses: perform a search based on the search criteria, the search retuning a set of metadata that may be associated with the media content (See column 6 lines 30-34).

McGrath differs from the claimed invention in that extract search criteria from media content stored on a DVD is not explicitly indicated. Oetzel however, does disclose: extract search criteria from media content stored on a DVD (See paragraph [0112] "Selecting name from the play list screen"). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teaching of Oetzel into the system of McGrath. The modification would have been obvious because using the metadata to extract the search criteria for finding and opening the DVD content makes the system more flexible for the user

As for claim 56, the rejection of claim 55 is incorporated and further McGrath discloses: enable a user to submit search criteria; and perform a search based on user-submitted search criteria, the search returning one or more sets of DVD metadata that satisfy the user-submitted search criteria (See column 5 lines 13-16).

As for claim 57, the rejection of claim 55 is incorporated, and further McGrath differs from the claimed invention in that instructions which, when executed, cause a

Art Unit: 2166

computer system to display a Wizard UI that enables a user to modify the DVD metadata is not explicitly indicated. Oetzel however, discloses instructions which, when executed, cause a computer system to display a Wizard UI that enables a user to modify the DVD metadata (See paragraph 0023 and note that all music guide is an interface).

As for claim 58, the rejection of claim 55 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses: provide a Wizard UI that enables a user to select DVD metadata', and associate the DVD metadata with the DVD ((See paragraph 0023 and figure 5).

As for claim 59, the rejection of claim 55 is incorporated and further, enable a user to submit DVD metadata to be associated with the DVD; and associate the user-submitted DVD metadata with the DVD (See paragraph 0023 note that user has to enter an confirm metadata "if desired" also note that information is associated with a particular DVD because menus have to be dynamically allocated).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oetzel and McGrath as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US 6701 478 (hereinafter Yang).

As for claim 2,Oetzel discloses bits stored on the DVD (See paragraph 0065 note that information is stored in bits). Oetzel and McGrath do not explicitly indicate

generating a 64-bit cyclical redundancy check. Yang however does disclose generating a 64-bit cyclical redundancy check (See column 2 lines 18-21 and column 3 lines 54-57). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Yang into the system of Oetzel and McGrath. The modification would have been obvious because you do not want to errors in the transmission of data and that is the reason for basing the check on the bits on the dvd.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oetzel and McGrath as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of US 6701 478 (hereinafter Yang).

As for claim 33, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, and further Oetzel discloses bits stored on the DVD (See paragraph 0065 note that information is stored in bits). Oetzel and McGrath do not explicitly indicate generating a 64-bit cyclical redundancy check. Yang however does disclose generating a 64-bit cyclical redundancy check (See column 2 lines 18-21 and column 3 lines 54-57). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Yang into the system of Oetzel and McGrath. The modification would have been obvious because you do not want to errors in the transmission of data and that is the reason for basing the check on the bits on the DVD.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 4/12/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Applicant Argues:**

Neither Oetzel nor McGrath, alone or in combination teaches or suggest searching a database that contains DVD metadata based on the DVD ID, and storing the DVD metadata that is displayed in a local media library, such that the DVD metadata is associated with the DVD ID in the local media library, as recited in claim 1.

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. 35 U.S.C. 103 (A) reads ) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. McGrath discloses a database for storing and searching videos (See McGrath column 3 lines 41-44). Since this database is designed to be accessed over the internet, it is vital that the database be able to distinguish uniquely and unambiguously between video clips (See McGrath column 4 lines 26-29). The system in Mcgrath uses SMPTE UMID to associate metadata files with proper video clip (See McGrath column 4 lines 30-34). It should be noted that on some levels

the disclosure of SMPTE UMID itself along with Oetzel would make the instant claimed invention obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. SMPTE UMID is used to identify metadata that is associated with audio or visual files. The metadata that UMID helps to associate with a given file can either be maintained within the file itself or in a separate database (See McGrath column 4 lines 30-33). Oetzel discloses a editable DVD that can generate menus and libraries dynamically based on the "Open DVD format" (See Oetzel paragraph 0026). The combination of Oetzel and McGrath discloses a DVD in which the egg section of the DVD contains UMID information that will link to associated metadata that is either purposefully not contained on the DVD or will not fit (Size of the DVD is a problem expressed with the Oetzel system disclosed in paragraph 0021 and is another motivating factor as to why an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art would combine the two inventions). Moreover, combining the two inventions is supported by the disclosure of Oetzel. Oetzel discloses that even while the disclosure uses a DVD for the purposes of illustration any medium can be used (See Oetzel paragraph 0037). The disclosure further supports the combination by then disclosing some of the optical disk based mediums (See Oetzel paragraph 0037).

Applicant Argues:

There is no suggestion in the prior art as a whole to combine the teachings for McGrath and Oetzel, as suggested by the Office.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Applicant Argues:

Neither Oetzel nor McGrath, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest a media player application and a media library stored in the same memory.

Examiner responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. If there was not a media player application stored in memory then the media would not play. Therefore all that needs to be disclosed is a media library stored in memory, and as disclosed in Oetzel while a DVD is used for illustration purposes, any medium can be used. (See Oetzel paragraph 0037). So in the embodiment where eggs are contained within memory in combination with the disclosure of McGrath to use UMIDs to store and unambiguously identify the metadata

that is associated with the different DVD files, then they are both stored in memory or else the media will not play.

Applicant Argues:

Neither Oetzel nor McGrath, alone nor in combination, teach or suggest extracting search criteria from media content stored on a DVD, and performing a search based on the search criteria.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. Oetzel discloses a search by playlist option (See paragraph 0112). When this option is selected a user can select a title and get a search generated based on artists, genres, albums, titles etc. (See paragraphs 0112, 0114, 0115).

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LJH  
Leon J. Harper  
June 14, 2006



MOHAMMAD ALI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER